

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Wilson. Independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite a slipping process, based on page 8, lines 15-16 in the specification, and Fig. 12. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because Wilson does not disclose (or suggest) the claimed invention, in which interrupt processing is performed while formatting a storage medium and formatting is restarted.

Wilson discloses a method for reallocating suspect sectors while writing data to a storage media. However, Wilson appears to disclose reallocation of sectors while writing data to a formatted storage medium on which sectors are already set. In contrast, in the claimed device (method) of the present invention, when an error is detected in track following information while setting recording areas (that is, while formatting a medium), interrupt processing is performed to avoid the defect, by performing the “slipping” process.

Thus, Wilson does not suggest the claimed invention, in which interrupt processing is performed while formatting a storage medium and formatting is restarted. Therefore, the claimed invention is patentable over Wilson.

Further, Wilson has a disadvantage compared with the present invention.

Wilson has two major techniques to avoid media defects, block slipping and block relocation (column 2, line 6 through column 3, line 45). As described in column 2, lines 49-64, block slipping has a major disadvantage because user data is moved. Thus, Wilson’s reallocation method appears to be based on the block relocation method (Fig. 4C, block 448, for example).

In contrast to Wilson’s method, the method of the present invention utilizes the “slipping” method since moving user data is not necessary while formatting a medium. As shown in Fig. 12 of the present application, the addresses are sequentially ordered even after the

sectors are slipped. On the other hand, the block relocation method used in Wilson degrades sequential performance because the physical order of the blocks on the disk no longer correlate to the relocated addressing order. Thus, performance for reading or writing the relocated sector data degrades after the block relocation is performed. The claimed invention does not have this disadvantage. For these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 6, and dependent claims 11 and 12, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 stand rejected under § 103 on the basis of Wilson and Nemazie. Applicant traverses this rejection for the reasons given with respect to independent claims 1 and 6.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

December 31, 2003  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315  
F:\Data\WP60\0941\63938\Amend D.doc